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## Framework

**The standard is consistency with utility maximizing rules**. **Actor Specificity**- Rule util is the only option for policymakers. **Goodin ‘90**[[1]](#footnote-1)

Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow [them] public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure that the payoff will do to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

**A.** Preempts is/ought fallacy and empirical constraints- generally speaking countries should and do act to promote overall wellbeing and constraints only exist because a pattern of consistency maximizes well being overall- defense proves my framework is more probable

**B.** No links indicts of the standard- policymakers act without full knowledge of every consequence or implication but are always obligated to act, which also makes deflationary arguments nonresponsive

Physical consequences are the only things we can observe. We may know our own intentions, but we don’t know the intentions of others so we cannot take those to be relevant to moral justification since they aren’t accessible to us. Reasoning is the process of providing justification to someone else, but if they can’t accept the premises, it can’t be a reason. Precludes other framework warrants since it links directly into the structure of ethical justification.

**And**, **epistemology** – truth is equivalent to usefulness. **James ‘07**[[2]](#footnote-2)

9. The importance to human life of having true beliefs about matters of fact is a thing too notorious. We live in a world of realities that can be infinitely useful or infinitely harmful. Ideas that tell us which of them to expect count as the true ideas in all this primary sphere of verification, and the pursuit of such ideas is a primary human duty. The possession of truth, so far from being here an end in itself, is only a preliminary means towards other vital satisfactions. If I am lost in the woods and starved, and find what looks like a cow-path, it is of the utmost importance that I should think of a human habitation at the end of it, for if I do so and follow it, I save myself. The true thought is useful here because the house which is its object is useful. The practical value of true ideas is thus primarily derived from the practical importance of their objects to us. Their objects are, indeed, not important at all times. I may on another occasion have no use for the house; and then my idea of it, however verifiable, will be practically irrelevant, and had better remain latent. Yet since almost any object may some day become temporarily important, the advantage of having a general stock of extra truths, of ideas that shall be true of merely possible situations, is obvious. We store such extra truths away in our memories, and with the overflow we fill our books of reference. Whenever such an extra truth becomes practically relevant to one of our emergencies, it passes from cold-storage to do work in the world, and our belief in it grows active. You can say of it then either that 'it is useful because it is true' or that 'it is true because it is useful.' Both these phrases mean exactly the same thing, namely that here is an idea that gets fulfilled and can be verified. True is the name for whatever idea starts the verification-process, useful is the name for its completed function in experience. True ideas would never have been singled out as such, would never have acquired a class-name, least of all a name suggesting value, unless they had been useful from the outset in this way.

**A.** implies util. To prove the resolution true as a general principle, we have to show its general usefulness or practical value to as a true statement. Rule util is the only theory of ethics that stems from taking into account the general pragmatic implications of our beliefs. No other philosophy meets the generality and practicality requirements of pragmatism. Act util or specific scenarios as offense do not link – they confuse the whole with its parts so don’t determine the truth of a general statement **B.** precludes other ethical claims – to say that your ethical theory should be used say that it’s true, but I contextualize what it means.

**Lastly, reductionism** – If your brain is divided, one to each of your triplet siblings then each is continuous with you in every way so there are two of you. But by definition, identity relations must obtain uniquely. Thus, personal identity is an illusion – lives are sensations and experiences which are loosely linked. The absence of personal identity commits us to consequentialism, and means that deontic autonomy or independence arguments don’t have a coherent subject. **Shoemaker ‘99**[[3]](#footnote-3)

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. Many people claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not justified in maximizing the good across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single, deeply unified person, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if the only justification for the different treatment of individual lives and sets of lives is the further fact, and this fact is undermined by the truth of reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment. There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives and sets of lives is mistaken. If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, would be the most plausible. Utilitarianism is just such a theory.

**Prefer structural impacts to long link chains and extinction scenarios**: **A.** extinction debate artificially inflate miniscule risks that aren’t considered by real policymakers so it’s not real-world, that comes first because the purpose of debate is to teach us portable skills, **B.** structural impacts have nearly 100% probability because they occur now, the number of links in any given chain, even if not indicted, mean that the probability approaches zero, so the size of the impact is too.

I’ll defend contractor and business assistance living wage laws. **Neumark ‘04[[4]](#footnote-4)**

However, rather than mandate higher wages for all workers—as a minimum wage does, except for minor coverage exclusions—a curious feature of living wage laws is their narrow coverage. In particular, the common feature of most of these laws is that they cover only employers that are contractors or subcontractors with the city, although some laws broaden coverage to include employers receiving business assistance from the city, and a few cover city employees. Estimates of the percentage of workers directly affected by coverage of contractors are usually quite low (below 1%); the other provisions of living wage laws boost the number of affected workers somewhat, but although there is no hard evidence, the general perception is that these other provisions do not boost coverage a great deal. This raises the question of why—-given the stated anti-poverty objectives—living wage laws are focused on raising wage ﬂoors for so few workers, as opposed to creating more general wage ﬂoors at the local level, which are exceedingly rare.

## Advantage 1 is Poverty.

Living wages lower poverty and strengthen growth. Negative effects are over-pronounced – best and most recent data. **Devinatz 13**[[5]](#footnote-5)

According to Freeman (2005, p. 23), most studies examining the economic effects of living wage ordinances find minimal job loss or other negative consequences in spite of the mandated increased wages. This is undoubtedly due to the relatively small number of persons covered by such laws as already mentioned. Many individual studies support Freeman’s (2005) conclusion. In a study involving data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) from January 1996 through December 2000, Neumark and Adams (2003, p. 561) discovered relatively weak disemployment effects due to wage increases from the implementation of living wage laws. They conclude, however, that the greatest disemployment effects occur among low-skilled workers. In a review article on the economic effects of living wage statutes, Adams and Neumark (2004, p. 236) arrive at two additional conclusions. While living wage ordinances increase the pay of low-wage workers, such statutes also compress the wage structure. Additionally, although living wage ordinances are related to lower employee turnover rates and improvements in employee performance, one should not necessarily assume that the implementation of such laws are costless or bring benefits that outweigh the costs. In an updated analysis by Adams and Neumark (2005, p. 99), these two researchers confirmed their earlier findings that living wage statutes increase the wages of the lowest paid workers although they lead to some job loss among these workers. Moreover, another finding that the implementation of living wage legislation reduces urban poverty was confirmed but more strongly for the laws based on companies receiving financial assistance than for the contractor-only statutes. Finally, Adams and Neumark (2005, p. 99) present new evidence that poverty reduction may occur after living wage law enactment due to other workers receiving wage gains as a result of the passage of living wage laws. In a study examining the growth rates of employment and unemployment before and after the enactment of living wage ordinances in 31 cities, Buss and Romeo (2006) discovered that only a minority of municipalities were negatively impacted by the implementation of these ordinances. Similarly, in a study of 19 California cities, Lester (2011, p. 252) found that the passage of living wage statutes did not negatively affect employment growth. Moreover, the enactment of such statutes also does not significantly damage the municipality’s business climate through establishments leaving the city, except for restaurants.

Prefer my evidence – **A. Specificity**: he studied implementation of actual living wage statutes, which are drastically higher and narrower in coverage than minimum wages– that means no neg studies apply. **B.** It cites academic consensus and studies in over 50 cities – outweighs all neg evidence since qualified experts can do better evidence assessment and comparison than students, and **C.** Any single study has some risk of bias or random error, a review of multiple studies over time with different methods is more likely to be true.

Impacts: **A. Health**: poverty is a huge impact to individual health, particular children **Covert ‘13**[[6]](#footnote-6)

Poverty has other negative impacts. The chronic stress of growing up in poverty has been found to impair[s] children’s brains, particularly in working memory. A study of veterans found that poverty is a bigger risk factor for mental illness than being exposed to warfare. The mental stress of being poor is also a major reason for why low-income people tend to have negative health outcomes like high blood pressure and cholesterol or elevated rates of obesity and diabetes. Poverty [also] takes its toll on health in a number of other critical ways: It prevents people from buying healthy food, makes people more likely to smoke, means they are more likely to live in areas with poor air quality, and can cause health problems that begin in the womb.

**B.** Threats to bodily security preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions other theories presuppose – so all my util offense outweighs theirs under any framework. It also prevents the instantiation of an ethical theory since individuals cannot reflect upon it, which is logically proior to any ethical theory

**And**, examples disprove the thesis of substantially decreased employment – wage compression and lower profits are the actual results. **Brenner ‘05[[7]](#footnote-7)**

This paper presents one of the first quantitative assessments of the effect living wage laws have had on firms covered by their mandate. Applying difference-in-difference estimation methods to survey data from Boston, Massachusetts, I find little evidence of reduced employment or hours worked, following living wage implementation. Instead, there is strong evidence that firms actually shifted from part-time towards full-time staffing as a result of Boston's living wage law. Estimates also reveal a substantial degree of wage compression within firms who raised wages. Finding no evidence of reduced employment or hours, this paper uses qualitative survey data to examine other ways in which firms may have adjusted to higher wages. I find some evidence that covered firms have taken lower profits as a way to adjust to the Boston law.

My offense outweighs neg unemployment turns. Try or die for the aff on this question - even full employment does not solve poverty – insufficient work and low pay rates. **Wicks-Lim ‘12**[[8]](#footnote-8)

Even Paid employment can leave workers and their families in poverty for two basic reasons: insufficient employment opportunities and inadequate pay rates. Since the beginning of the Great Recession in 2009, policymakers have focused nearly exclusively on the issue of jobs. What gets lost in the panic over unemployment and underemployment—though justified—is that before the Great Recession, millions of fully-employed workers already filled the ranks of the working poor. Without aggressively addressing the issue of low-wage work, a large share of workers and their households will continue to live in poverty. To focus sharply on how low wages create a class of the working poor, the first column of Table 1 presents some basic figures for the year 2000 on the work status of poor indi- viduals. The year 2000 is the last full year of a ten-year-long expansion that produced the lowest unemployment rate—4.0 percent—of the last three decades. The figures for this year should tell us something about how full employment would reduce poverty. In this the near-full-employment economy in 2000, nearly one in three (31.5 percent), or 54.5 million, prime-working-age adults (eighteen to sixty-five years old) lived in poor households. Among these individuals, the large majority (68.1 percent) participated in the workforce— either by working or wanting to work at some point during the year.5 Among the other 31.9 percent of poor adults—individuals not in the workforce—nearly all (92.4 percent) either have other responsibilities that interfere with working (taking care of family or going to school) or they are unable to work (because they are ill, disabled, or retired). For these individuals, paid employment will not adequately address their income needs. Focusing now on individuals who are in the labor force and poor, even in a near-full- employment economy, 16.6 percent seek more work and have partial schedules for “economic” reasons (14.8 percent wanted to work more, and another 1.8 percent did not work at all because they could not find a job). Getting enough work clearly remains a problem for some people, even when there is a historically low unemployment rate. But the majority of the working poor (54 percent) do not escape poverty despite working full-time, year-round. For these workers, too- low wages create the gap between their earnings and their household needs. The average hourly wage among the working poor is $10.00 (see Figure 1).6 Full-time, year-round earnings at this rate—$20,800—fall 52 percent short of the $43,500 that the average worker with a small family (two adults and one child) needs to maintain a minimally decent living standard.7 Even two adults working full-time, year-round, at $10.00 an hour would leave a $2,000 gap. Fast forward ten years to 2010, which had a 9.6 percent unemployment rate. We can clearly see the role of massive job losses and reduced hours in pushing U.S. workers and their families into poverty (column 2, Table 1). Now, 37.7 percent of prime-working-age adults are poor. Fully 36.5 percent are now either unemployed or underemployed. Still, even in 2010, just over two in five poor workers had full-time jobs year-round. They couldn’t make ends meet because of their low pay rate. Over the decade, the average wage among the working poor hovered just over $10.00 (after adjusting for inflation), reaching $10.70 near the peak of the last business cycle in 2006. By 2010, the average wage among the working poor was $10.32, only slightly higher than where it started at the beginning of the decade. So why are working people poor? Employment levels certainly matter. The share of prime-working-age adults who can’t make ends meet shot up from 31 percent in 2000 to 38 percent in 2010. But wages matter too. As the earlier figures show, whether the economy is barely recovering from a severe recession (2010) or operating at a high level of activity (2000), a large share of poor workers—roughly between 40 and 50 percent—are fully employed but struggle because they earn poverty wages. In other words, to reduce the ranks of the working poor we must focus on the quality of jobs, not just on the unemployment rate.

## Advantage 2 is Unionization.

Two internal links. **First,** empirics confirm living wages boost union strength. **Neumark 2[[9]](#footnote-9)**

The main contribution of the paper is an empirical analysis of the effects of living wage laws on unionized municipal workers. The evidence indicates that wages of unionized municipal workers are increased as a result of contractor living wage laws. In particular, focusing attention on lower-skilled unionized municipal workers, and on those occupations most likely to be affected, the evidence indicates elasticities of average wages with respect to living wages centered around 18. This finding generally holds up in a variety of analyses. Moreover, comparisons of estimated effects for unionized municipal workers who - under the rent-seeking hypothesis - should be affected by living wages, with estimated effects for alternative groups of workers that should not experience any impact under this hypothesis, uniformly indicate positive effects only for the former, making more plausible the rent-seeking interpretation of the estimated effects of living wage laws on wages of unionized municipal workers. As a final piece of corroborating evidence, the paper presents some material indicating that the main unions involved in organizing municipal workers are heavily involved in living wage campaigns. Of course unions may have other incentives to back initiatives to pass living wage laws. But if living wage laws partly reflect rent-seeking on the part of municipal unions, we would expect organizations representing unionized municipal workers to be involved in political efforts to pass living wage laws.

Prefer Neumark: empirically reviews living wage laws and combines it with a historical analysis that confirms this motivation. He also provides an analytic warrant. **Neumark 3[[10]](#footnote-10)**

The hypothesis I consider in this paper is that a principal effect of living wage laws is to benefit unionized municipal employees who might otherwise face competition from low-wage labor employed by city contractors and subcontractors. By raising the wages that city contractors must pay, living wage laws may reduce the incentives for cities to contract out work that would otherwise be done by unionized municipal employees. It is natural to consider such restrictions as potentially enhancing union bargaining power, and hence in particular protecting or increasing rents for unionized municipal workers. In other words, living wage laws may act principally to offer unionized municipal workers protection from low-wage workers, rather than to offer protection for low-wage workers.

The combination of both empirical and analytic warrants *in a single study* should outweigh either one since it means much more explanatory coherence and make it possible to eliminate the possibility of alt causes

**Second,** Institutionalization of legal entitlements against employers is critical – helps organizing in the long term as well. **Rogers ‘14[[11]](#footnote-11)**

The literature on law and social movements also helps elucidate the relationship between legal rights and self-respect. Much of this literature explores the relationship between legal rights and collective mobilization, an issue less central to this Article.170 But the very existence of such a link demonstrates that legal rights, particularly rights against private parties, can be an important social basis of self-respect. Per Stuart Scheingold’s influential account of the “politics of rights,” for example, marginalized groups can “capitalize on the perceptions of entitlement associated with [legal] rights to initiate and to nurture political mobilization.”171 This process can have effects on workers’ self-consciousness and self-respect that extend well beyond immediate campaigns. As two other sociologists argue in a leading study of social movements among the poor, after the assertion of legal rights as part of a demand for social change, “people who ordinarily consider themselves helpless come to believe that they have some capacity to alter their lot.”172 Similarly, I have argued elsewhere that the experience of contesting managerial decisions during union organizing can greatly enhance workers’ autonomy by giving them a concrete experience of agency.17

Unions institutionalize norms of fair play – they make things better for all workers and union decline spills over. I solve the root cause of rising inequality. **Western ‘11**[[12]](#footnote-12)

Union effects on unions on nonunion workers can be motivated in sev- eral ways. Nonunion employers may raise wages to avert the threat of union organization (Leicht 1989). We argue that unions also contribute to a moral economy that institutionalizes norms for fair pay, even for nonunion workers. In the early 1970s, when 1 in 3 male workers were or- ganized, unions were often prominent voices for equity, not just for their members, but for all workers. Union decline marks an erosion of the moral economy and its underlying distributional norms. Wage inequality in the nonunion sector increased as a result. Our analysis estimates union effects on wage inequality by decompos- ing the growth in hourly wage inequality for full-time workers in the pri- vate sector. Analysis of the Current Population Survey (CPS) shows that union decline explains a fifth of the increase in inequality among men and none of the increase among women if only union wages are considered. The effect of union decline grows when we account for the link between unionization and nonunion wages. In this case, deunionization explains a fifth of the inequality increase for women, and a third for men. The decline of organized labor among men contributes as much to rising wage inequality as the growing stratification of pay by education.

Empirics confirm – union political and workplace presences have succeeded. **Western 2**[[13]](#footnote-13)

US unions also promoted norms of equity that narrowed pay dispar- ities in the nonunion sector. The normative influence of unions has cul- tural, political and institutional dimensions. Culturally, industrial unions in particular often promoted a public language of social solidarity. Speak- ing of unions’ role as an advocate for fairer working and living conditions, a former Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL-CIO once put it: “We are the peoples lobby” (Kotz 1977: 146). Under Walter Reuther’s leadership, the United Auto Workers (UAW) pressed the Kennedy and Johnson Ad- ministrations for quick passage of Civil Rights legislation. Reuther spoke at the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, urging the govern- ment to fulfill its “promise of full citizenship rights and equal rights for all Americans” (Los Angeles Times 1963). Politically, American unions have been frequent advocates for redistributive public policy. Highly unionized states have been found to have higher minimum wage rates and congressmen from such states are more likely to support minimum wage increases (Cox and Oaxaca 1982; Kau and Rubin 1978). Union political pressure extended beyond wages to social legislation. For example, major unions regularly backed proposals for universal health-care and supported the creation of Medicare in the mid-1960s. In the 1970s, 53 unions joined nu- merous states in a lawsuit challenging cutbacks in the federal food stamp[s] program, and threatened to sue again in 1980 to keep the program solvent.

Impacts

**A.** Drastically mitigates the impact of employment DAs to the aff – generally beneficial policies get passed which makes the environment better for everyone, workers or not.

**B.** At best you can solve wages so I outweigh: the conditions of work are only made better by institutional presences *in the workplace*. People not only get paid more for work, but work in better conditions which makes them better off than they otherwise would be. Evidence is about the minimum wage but Neumark 3 shows the principle still applies. **Konczal 14**[[14]](#footnote-14)

When low-wage workers protest at fast food restaurants, low wages are not necessarily their sole concern. The working conditions may be equally important. Between a lack of sick days, random shift scheduling, and working without pay, there is a host of problems and humiliations from which workers seek redress. Civic republicanism presses against these practices. Philip Pettit, the philosopher most associated with this strain of thinking, defines its goal in terms of “freedom as non-domination,” freedom “as a condition under which a person is more or less immune to interference on an arbitrary basis.” In what sense can people be considered free if their means of survival places them at the mercy of an erratic schedule, thereby preventing the formation of civic and communal ties? Surveys of New York City’s low-wage workers find that 84 percent of them are not paid for their entire workday. When bosses can flout labor contracts and arbitrarily impose working conditions in this way, workers lack the kind of freedom that civic republicans celebrate. By making the labor market tighter through lower turnover and vacancies, a higher minimum wage creates bargaining power for workers and will help to eliminate these kinds of domination.

**C.** Squo nonpassage means that alts are ineffective – no political will for enforcement means your law is toothless without the aff, unions were the ones who pushed for that enforcement, as food stamps prove.

## Underview

**First**, The aff is structurally disadvantaged – 8% side bias at Apple Valley[[15]](#footnote-15), plus the fact that the debaters flip neg regardless of the topic indicates that allocation of blocks of time advantage the negative – even if the aff has certain advantages, they’re empirically outweighed.

**Second,** aff needs RVIs to compensate for the neg’s ability to split the 2NR 50-50 between theory and substance and always be ahead on any layer if the aff is forced to do the same split in the 1AR, making it strategically plausible for affs to collapse to theory is the only way to allow the aff a reasonable chance at winning. But, the ease with which the neg can split the 2N means no neg RVIs, since they can win theory and still have a substantial time advantage on substance, regardless of how much time the 1AR invests in the shell.

**Third**, the neg may only derive reasons to vote for them from their advocacy of a prohibition on the resolutional action. Key to predictability – I devote 6 minutes to offense with an understanding of what the neg’s offense will be. The ability to moot that or uplayer is irreciprocal and unfair – lets the neg exploit 13 minutes of reactive speech time to screw over the aff.

**Fourth**, judges should adopt reflective equilibrium as their paradigm for resolving arguments. **Scanlon ‘12**[[16]](#footnote-16):

This is what we were talking about earlier with debate. A lot of people, at least a lot of students, tell you that if you can’t come up with an argument that some imagined opponent would have to accept on pain of some kind of contradiction, then who’s to say what’s right? And I think that’s the sort of thing that debate encourages. It belies the fact that the question, at the end of the day, isn’t: is this person actually going to accept it? The question is: do they actually have good reason to accept it, or not? And that’s a judgment that you yourself have got to make. That’s unavoidable. But I think people lose sight of the fact that philosophy is mostly about deciding what to think, rather than about trying to convince other[s] people what to think.¶ This bring to mind a line in the first edition of John Rawls’ Theory of Justice, the section on reflection equilibrium. It’s a passage I particularly love. Unfortunately Rawls took it out in the second edition. Why he did, I don’t know. I asked him late in his life and he said he couldn’t remember, that it seemed fine to him. But, anyway, he says: Moral philosophy is Socratic. Even if we come up with a set of principles that fully accounts for our considered judgments in a given area, that might itself give us reason to change those judgments once we see that these are the only principles that would support them – even if the fit is perfect. If that’s what’s going on, then it doesn’t stand up to critical examination. I always thought that was a really great point.

Rule-consequentialism coheres with our judgements in reflective equilibria. **Hooker 2k[[17]](#footnote-17)**

Does rule-consequentialism accord with the convictions we share about moral permissibility and requirement? **Rule-consequentialism selects rules on the basis of expected value, impartially calculated**. Thus the theory is clearly impartial at the level of rule selection. As I shall argue later, the impartial assessment of rules **[But this] will favour rules that** (a) **allow partiality**, within limits, towards self and (b) require partiality, within limits, towards family, friends, etc. This partiality towards self and loved ones will then be allowed to guide a great number of people’s day to day decisions (not all, of course). Therefore, while rule-consequentialism is purely impartial at the foundational level where a code is selected, the code thus selected makes demands on action that are moderate and intuitively plausible. Rule-consequentialism is fundamentally impartial, but not implausibly demanding. // Rule-consequentialism [It] also accords with common moral beliefs about what we are prohibited from doing to others. As I observed, most of us believe morality [**and] prohibits** physically **attacking innocent people,** taking or harming the possessions of others, **breaking our promise**s, telling lies, and so on. Rule-consequentialism endorses prohibitions on these kinds of act, since on the whole the consequences, considered impartially, will be far better if such prohibitions are widely accepted. (In Chapter 6, I argue that rule-consequentialism’s implications concerning prohibitions and special duties are plausible.

**Fifth is the punishment paradigm**, on T reevaluate my offense under their interp – **A.** Competing mutually exclusive interps force the to be subject to some shell every round, which creates free, no-risk NC preclusion. I have to pick an interp, so don’t punish me for going into the round blind – true for theory as well, so it should have the same implication. **B.** I can’t read T on the neg so it’s irreciprocal if they can win on it, it’s a layer I can’t have offense on that can be made to outweigh any theory argument.

**Sixth, At worst**, if T is drop the debater adopt reasonability with a brightline of being the definition used in a study even if it’s not the best: that’s key to check back infinite T interps and indicates that I made an effort to be T so it’s unfair to punish me for what I had no control over. Also means neg abuse is marginal at best – if it’s in a review of living wage policies that means it’s what at least some of the lit talks about and what studies refer to. All my arguments above are reasons why the abuse of reading T outweighs the abuse of any definition that meets this threshold.

**Seventh**, solutions to critical issues must be discussed through pragmatic approaches within hegemonic power structures. **Kapoor ‘08[[18]](#footnote-18)**

There are perhaps several other social movement campaigns that could be cited as examples of a ‘hybridizing strategy’.5 But what emerges as important from the Chipko and NBA campaigns is the way in which they treat laws and policies, institutional practices, and ideological apparatuses as deconstructable. That is, they refuse to take dominant authority at face value, and proceed to reveal its contingencies. Sometimes, they expose what the hegemon is trying to disavow or hide (exclusion of affected communities in project design and implementation, faulty information gathering and dissemination). Sometimes, they problematize dominant or naturalized truths (‘development = unlimited economic growth = capitalism’, ‘big is better’, ‘technology can save the environment’). In either case, by contesting, publicizing, and politicizing accepted or hidden truths, they hybridize power, challenging its smugness and triumphalism, revealing its impurities. They show power to be, literally and figuratively, a bastard. While speaking truth to power, a hybridizing strategy also exploits the instabilities of power. In part, this involves showing up and taking advantage of the equivocations of power - conﬂicting laws, contradictory policies, unfulfilled promises. A lot has to do here with publicly shaming the hegemon, forcing it to remedy injustices and live up to stated commitments in a more accountable and transparent manner. And, in part, this involves nurturing or manipulating the splits and strains within institutions. Such maneuvering can take the form of cultivating allies, forging alliances, or throwing doubt on prevailing orthodoxy. Note, lastly, the way in which a hybridizing strategy works with the dominant discourse. This reﬂects the negotiative aspect of Bhabha’s performativity. The strategy may outwit the hegemon, but it does so from the interstices of the hegemony. The master may be paralyzed, but his paralysis is induced using his own poison/medicine. It is for this reason that cultivating allies in the adversarial camp is possible: when you speak their language and appeal to their own ethical horizons, you are building a modicum of common ground. It is for this reason also that the master cannot easily dismiss or crush you. Observing his rules and playing his game makes it difficult for him not to take you seriously or grant you a certain legitimacy. The use of non-violent tactics may be crucial in this regard: state repression is easily justified against violent adversaries, but it is vulnerable to public criticism when used against non-violence. Thus, the fact that Chipko and the NBA deployed civil disobedience — pioneered, it must be pointed out, by the ‘father of the nation’ (i.e. Gandhi) — made it difficult for the state to quash them or deﬂect their claims.

# Advantage Frontlines

## 1AR Probability Weighing

Systemic impacts should come first – focus on existential risk causes policy paralysis, which prevents us from accessing impacts in the first place. **Rescher ‘83[[19]](#footnote-19)**

The stakes are high, the potential benefits enormous. (And so are the costs - for instance cancer research and, in particular, the multi-million dollar gamble on interferon.) But there is no turning back the clock. The processes at issue are irreversible. Only through the shrewd deployment of science and technology can we resolve the problems that science and technology themselves have brought upon us. America seems to have backed off from its traditional entrepreneurial spirit and become a risk-aversive, slow investing economy whose (real-resource) support for technological and scientific innovation has been declining for some time. In our yearning for the risk-free society we may well create a social system that makes risk-taking innovation next to impossible. The critical thing is to have a policy that strikes a proper balance between malfunctions and missed opportunities - a balance whose "propriety" must be geared to a realistic appraisal of the hazards and opportunities at issue. Man is a creature condemned to live in a twilight zone of risk and opportunity. And so we are led back to Aaron Wildavski's thesis that flight from risk is the greatest risk of all, "because a total avoidance of risks means that society will become paralyzed, depleting its resources in preventive action, and denying future generations opportunities and technologies needed for improving the quality of life. By all means let us calculate our risks with painstaking care, and by all means let us manage them with prudent conservatism. But in life as in warfare there is truth in H. H. Frost's maxim that "every mistake in war is excusable except inactivity and refusal to take risks" (though, obviously, it is needful to discriminate between a good risk and a bad one). The price of absolute security is absolute stultification.

1. **Extend** the analytic under James – the truth of a general statement isn’t proven by specific instances, that confuses the statement with a particular instantiation so don’t logically negate under the framework
2. **Extend** that long link chains means tons of assumption – giving them 10% chance of any link is wildly optimistic, but still means a 3-link chain has virtually no chance of happening.
3. **Extend** that extinction scenarios inflate miniscule risks, aren’t considered by policymakers, and that real world comes first because it’s the most important in our lives. Means that the judge shouldn’t vote on them because it’s a bad model of debate, conceded paragraph theory is an issue for you
4. No extinction impacts – we would rely on very specific link chains with unstable uniqueness and we can’t compare rules that are more likely to lead to human extinction since it hasn’t happened yet.

## Poverty Advantage

### Children Health Weighing (Ram)

**A.** Life-years- when lives come into conflict we ought to prefer those of children since they have more years to live - provides a mechanism by which we compare impacts, via the quality of life-years.

**B.** Reversibility – my evidence indicates poverty causes long-term systematic impacts throughout their lifetime instead of a singular instance of harm. Allowing it now means no possibility of rectifying that harm later, so stopping this NOW is key – you can resolve more transient impacts at any point and still increase future utility.

**C.** Rules that prioritize children are utility maximizing:

1. their dependence means that they cannot care for themselves, while other agents have a chance to act to ameliorate their situation, so an impact to children is structurally guaranteed.

2. long term survival of institutions depends on intergenerational obligations – I access any potential beneficial to society in general since it cannot continue otherwise.

## Unionization Advantage

### Cap Impact

Union organizing transcends divisions that strengthen capitalist domination – prerequisite to actualizing their alternative. **Smith[[20]](#footnote-20)**

“Divide and conquer” has long been the watchword of the ruling class. Capitalism forces workers into competition with each other—native vs. foreign born, skilled vs. unskilled, etc.—exploiting every opportunity to keep workers divided. Organizing into unions, which present the opportunity for collective struggle against the employers, thereby reduces competition between workers. In 1845, Engels argued, But what gives these Unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They imply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the Unions direct themselves against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order.21

### Transgender Rights Impact

Unions are good for queer and trans people in particular – lack of legal protections mean unions are key, the process of organizing is intrinsically good and it creates a platform for further efforts. **Redburn ‘14[[21]](#footnote-21)**

Enter Out in the Union: A Labor History of Queer America, a surprising new book by Miriam Frank. Starting roughly in the 1970s and ending close to the present day, Frank chronicles a history of LGBT unionists transforming the labor movement by demanding union policies and then labor contracts that protected queer and trans workers from discrimination and substantially improved their material conditions. She draws on an impressive oral history archive to portray the vibrant internal dynamics of the labor movement as queer and trans members and leaders forced it to grapple with their rights and needs. Most crucially, Frank notes that in many places a union contract is the only thing protecting LGBT workers from discrimination, given the lack of federal legal protections and court silence on the issue. This is the book’s single greatest achievement: arguing not explicitly but by preponderance of evidence that unions have been crucial to the growth and success of the modern LGBT rights movement. It flips our standard readings, while suggesting powerful ways forward for the American workforce. The hard work of organizing for fair conditions develops solidarity between workers, and the political bond reduces the divisive potency of sexuality and gender. Through their involvement in the labor movement, queer and trans workers have not only promoted their particular needs but engaged in a process of politicization that created a blueprint for the LGBT rights movement, and perhaps for social justice movements to come.

# AT Disads

## AT Unemployment Turns

### AT Relocation

No link to the plan – living wages for government contractors aren’t place-based, and you opt out by not contracting not by moving. **Chapman and Thompson ‘06[[22]](#footnote-22)**

In summary, the best empirical research has shown that the adoption of higher wage floors has not resulted in measurable employment loss.. Yet many prospective studies predict the opposite. While some predictions of job losses resulting from living wage ordinances have been based on perfectly defensible, if not empirically supported reasoning, others are simply re-treads from different debates that are not actually relevant to living wage ordinances. One such argument is that firms will relocate to avoid having to pay a living wage. This is a standard (and generally unproven) argument in the debate over minimum wage laws, but it is not relevant to living wage ordinances. Living wage policies, particularly the predominant contractor-only variety, are typically not place-based policies. A service contractor can elect to not submit bids for future contracts should they not wish to abide by the living wage mandate. As long as they continue to contract, however, they will be covered by the law regardless of whether they relocate or not. For the few living wage ordinances that are place-based (in that they apply to firms leasing public facilities), it is either not feasible to relocate (airlines) or the geographic region of application is so narrow that firm relocation would not necessarily imply job loss for a city even if such relocation made sense (airport concessionaires or firms leasing other types of public facilities.) In any event, estimates provided by Pollin suggest that the costs imposed on firms from living wage ordinances are too low to justify relocation as a feasible response even if it were possible to dodge the living wage ordinance requirements by doing so (Pollin 2005). In Los Angeles, 81% of firms that were forced to raise wages did not cut any jobs, in large part because “either the number of workers affected was small or the size of the required raises was minimal” (Fairris et al. 2005, 95).

## AT Crime Turn

**Turn:** living wage ordinances reduce crime, empirically confirmed **Fernandez ‘13[[23]](#footnote-23)**

V . Conclusion In this paper, we evaluate the unintended consequences of living wage policies on crime. Using a panel of annual city level crime rates from 1990 to 2010, two contributions are made to the existing literature. First, while previous studies have focused on the impact of living wages on the labor market, we are the first to study the impact of living wages on related deviant behaviors. Second, using the panel data set of cities, we are able to explicitly mitigate the potential endogeneity bias of living wage ordinances using a variety of empirical approaches. We find robust evidence that living wage ordinances lead to modest reductions in expected robbery, burglary, larceny, and MVT rates, but have no impact on non-pecuniary violent crimes such as homicide, assault, and rape. These findings are supported in a variety of different regression models. Depending on the specification and the crime being examined, our elasticity estimates for the three property related crimes lie between -0.03 and -0.2.

1. specificity…
2. Solves bias. **Fernandez 2[[24]](#footnote-24)**

As with all such studies, a primary concern is that living wage ordinances may not be exogenous; living wages may be adopted or changed in response to factors that are unobserved to the econometrician but are arguably associated with crime. For example, local labor market conditions, the fiscal stability of local governments, and social services provided by local governments may all be associated with living wage provisions and crime.

# AT Counterplans

## Generic

1. No reason to prefer the CP – the A point under Western 2 in the AC means that I access the passage of the CP by boosting union political strength to push for liberal policies, impact to timeframe is minimal at best and isn’t even explained in the last speech, so you should give them zero leeway on it.

2. **Perm**, **do both**. – the D analytic under Weston means the CP isn’t enforced without union political pressure, so it doesn’t solve otherwise. AC is a necessary stepping stone to any future policy. This analysis is all in the AC, the 2NR is too late to respond to it.

## AT Basic Income CP

1. **Perm**, **do both**. **A.** policies are almost entirely unrelated since the plan affects like 1% of workers that are contractor employees, the competition arguments don’t assume the plan – any net benefit is sufficient in that context so any redundancy is minimal and aff advantages would outweigh. **B.** Basic income ensures that people don’t slip through the cracks of a living wage system and mitigates unemployment DAs to the aff.

2. CP can’t solve unionization, net benefit to the perm and reason the aff is better – three warrants **A.** The Neumark internal link in the AC is the inability to outsource – the universality of basic income means that it doesn’t have that effect, contractors can still charge less and let cities mount an end-run around unions. **B**. AC Rogers ev is clear – the system of institutional rights *against private parties* is the what creates the organizational advantage, CP is government based so you don’t solve. **C.** government transfers aren’t directly experienced the same way – this evidence is comparative. **Rogers ‘14[[25]](#footnote-25)**

Transfers simply have a different valence: they alter power relationships between workers and employers indirectly, if at all. While a robust basic income would enable workers to reject truly undignified work, it would not alter the legal rules that undergird the division of labor.159 Employers would still enjoy the legal right to issue orders and low-wage workers would still need to obey. Altering parties’ bilateral entitlements is therefore an appropriate policy response. Minimum wages are also far more salient to workers than transfers.160 As noted above, wages are paid weekly or biweekly by the employer, reflecting the employer’s reciprocal duties toward workers; in contrast transfers come from the state, an abstract entity that typically exerts power over workers only indirectly. Wage subsidies would avoid some of these difficulties since workers receive money directly from their employer, but wage subsidies have other drawbacks, as discussed below.161

Also controls the internal link to the CP solvency – Western 2 proves that funding is only maintained by union political enforcement, so the perm is necessary, even if it’s redundant for 1% of workers.

3. Can’t solve inequality. More comparative evidence. **Waltman ‘02[[26]](#footnote-26)**

When it come to softening inequality, the living wage wins again. Because everyone gets the same UBI, there is no compressing of income skews. In fact, a UBI could actually increase inequality. Affluent people would have more money to invest, and the long term impacts of accumulation versus spending would exacerbate the wealth gap. A living wage, as I define it, would at least keep everyone in sight of the mean.

Brenner in the AC means I access wage compression, aff is better – money for the worse off is taken off the top so I solve

# AT Ks/Phil NCs

## AT Radical K (Generic)

1. Reformism is effective and brings revolutionary change closer. **Delgado 9[[27]](#footnote-27)**

e CLS critique of piecemeal reform is familiar, imperialistic and wrong. Minorities know from bitter experience that occasional court victories do not mean the Promised Land is at hand. The critique is imperialistic in that it tells minorities and other oppressed peoples how they should interpret events affecting them. A court order directing a housing authority to disburse funds for heating in subsidized housing may postpone the revolution, or it may not. In the meantime, the order keeps a number of poor families warm. This may mean more to them than it does to a comfortable academic working in a warm office. It smacks of paternalism to assert that the possibility of revolution later outweighs the certainty of heat now,¶ unless there is evidence for that possibility. The Crits do not offer such evidence. Indeed, some incremental changes may bring revolutionary changes closer, not push them further away. Not all small reforms induce complacency; some may whet the appetite for further combat. The welfare family may hold a tenants‘ union meeting in their heated living room. CLS scholars‘ critique of piecemeal reform often misses these possibilities, and neglects the question of whether total change, when it comes, will be what we want.

Means case outweighs –

**A.** probability: reformist policies make things concretely better, the K is a speculative long-term improvement, and the internal link is unclear at best

**B.** I coopt their link scenario, the aff solves: extreme poverty means people can’t participate in movements because of material concerns. I allow that participation

**C.** paternalism and imperialism are a reason to reject their args on a higher level: it’s incredibly problematic to say someone’s lived experience doesn’t rise to the level of deserving to be addressed, it makes the debate space unsafe for victims of particular oppressions.

2. policy proposals are the best political strategy – ideological perfection isn’t helpful or necessary. Real change is accomplished by action, your revolutionary politics is literally laughable otherwise. **Turrión ‘14[[28]](#footnote-28)**

When you study successful transformational movements, you see that the key to success is to establish a certain identity between your analysis and what the majority feels. And that is very hard. It implies riding out contradictions. Do you think I have any ideological problem with a forty-eight hour or a seventy-two-hour wildcat strike? Not in the least! The problem is that organizing a strike has nothing to do with how badly you or I want to do it. It has to do with union strength, and both you and I are insignificant there. You and I may wish that earth were a paradise for all mankind. We can wish whatever we want, and put it on a t-shirt. But politics is about strength, it is not about wishes or what we say in assemblies. In this country there are only two unions with the ability to organize a general strike: the CCOO and the UGT. Do I like that? No. But it is what it is, and organizing a general strike is very difficult. I’ve manned the picket lines in front of the bus depots in Madrid. The people there, at dawn, you know where they had to go? To work. They were no scabs. But they would be fired from their jobs, because at their jobs there were no unions to defend them. Because the workers who can defend themselves, like those in the shipyards, in the mines, they have strong unions. But the kids that work as telemarketers, or at pizza joints, or the girls working in retail, they cannot defend themselves. They are going to be canned the day after the strike, and you are not going to be there, and I am not going to be there, and no union is going to be there guaranteeing them that they’re going to sit down with the boss and tell him: you’d better not fire this person for exercising their right to strike, because you are going to pay a price for it. That doesn’t happen, no matter how enthusiastic we may be. Politics is not what you or I would like it to be. It is what it is, and it is terrible. Terrible. And that’s why we must talk about popular unity, and be humble. Sometimes you have to talk to people who don’t like your language, with whom the concepts you use to explain don’t resonate. What does that tell us? That we have been defeated for many years. Losing all the time implies just that: that people’s “common sense” is different [from what we think is right]. But that is not news. Revolutionaries have always known that. The key is to succeed in making “common sense” go in a direction of change. César Rendueles, a very smart guy, says most people are against capitalism, and they don’t know it. Most people defend feminism and they haven’t read Judith Butler or Simone de Beauvoir. Whenever you see a father doing the dishes or playing with his daughter, or a grandfather teaching his grandkid to share his toys, there is more social transformation in that than in all the red flags you can bring to a demonstration. And if we fail to understand that those things can serve as unifiers, they will keep laughing at us. That’s how the enemy wants us. He want us small, speaking a language no one understands, in a minority, hiding behind our traditional symbols. He is delighted with that, because he knows that as long as we are like that, we are not dangerous. We can have a really radical discourse, say we want to do a general wildcat strike, talk about the people in arms, brandish symbols, carry portraits of the great revolutionaries to our demonstrations — they are delighted with that! They laugh at us. However, when you gather together hundreds, thousands of people, when you start convincing the majority, even those who voted for the enemy — that’s when they start to be afraid. And that is called “politics.” That is what we need to learn.

## AT Cap K

1. You’ve conceded my unionization advantage which means coalitional politics are a net benefit to the aff over the k and to the perm – sure unions are embedded in capital, but so is everything. Union organizing transcends divisions that strengthen capitalist domination – prerequisite to actualizing their alternative. **Smith[[29]](#footnote-29)**

“Divide and conquer” has long been the watchword of the ruling class. Capitalism forces workers into competition with each other—native vs. foreign born, skilled vs. unskilled, etc.—exploiting every opportunity to keep workers divided. Organizing into unions, which present the opportunity for collective struggle against the employers, thereby reduces competition between workers. In 1845, Engels argued, But what gives these Unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They imply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the Unions direct themselves against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order.21

2. Strategic alliances with bureaucrats are the key to any anticapitalist approach. This is weighing for impacts back to their framework – worker conscientization and engagement are key, rhetorical pronouncements are worth absolutely nothing. **Cliff[[30]](#footnote-30)**

This common action can be useful in developing the working-class struggle, for although even the most left elements of the bureaucracy remain unreliable and unstable, a temporary alliance of revolutionaries with them can weaken the[ir] hold of the bureaucracy as a whole. A revolutionary party must know how to exploit the division between left and right bureaucrats, between those who are prepared to make militant speeches (even if they will not act upon them) and those who are openly wedded to conciliation at all times. Through using this division the independence, initiative and self-confidence of the rank and file may be strengthened, on one condition: the party must make clear that the rank and file cannot trust the left officials or put their faith in radical rhetoric. The party must always remind trade unionists that even if bureaucrats put themselves at the head of a movement of insurgent workers, they do so in order better to control that movement. An alliance with left bureaucrats is only a means to broad action. Even the best and most radical speeches should never become a substitute for the action of the mass of workers themselves. Such an alliance, like every other tactic in the trade union field, must be judged by one criterion, and one criterion only—whether it raises the activity, and hence the confidence and consciousness of the workers.43

Outweighs for a couple other reasons: **A.** prerequisite to their alt in particular – workers are the ones who can actually *do* it, you cannot advocate for the end but prohibit the only possible means. **B.** Internal divisions disprove the idea that the state is a single malevolent entity, so you should prefer a political strategy that’s coherent even in light of that fact

This is independent of unionization – you conceded the Rogers evidence, living wages institutionalize employer duties to employees and make it possible to workers to understand their transformative potential. Specificity matters most – others confuse the size of the link, one policy probably isn’t the brink for anticapitalist praxis in most cases, but I isolate a unique advantage

## AT Libertarian NC

1. The plan is a requirement that you pay a living wage **if** you want business assistance from the government or you want to do business with the government. You’re under no obligation to do either. It’s the government exercising it’s right as a contracting agent. Couple of impacts:

**A.** **Turns the NC** - any sort of prohibition on the plan is inconsistent with the framework since it would prevent a contractual exchange both parties had consented to

**B.** Terminally excludes NC offense – you don’t have anything to weigh even if you’re winning the framework debate so we’d default to the aff: even a libertarian doesn’t discount consequentialist considerations, they just consider the side constraint more important

2. [read generic AT Libertarian NC blocks]
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